

REMARKS

The present application relates to inbred maize line PH0GC. Claims 2-57 have been canceled. Claims 3, 11-14, 17-20, 22, 28-36, 44, and 47-49 were previously canceled in the Amendment of April 22, 2003 and claims 45 and 46 were previously canceled in the amendment of October 15, 2002. New claims 58-87 have been added. No new matter has been added by the present amendment. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks.

Detailed Action

A. Claim and Specification Objections

Applicant acknowledges that those rejections not specifically addressed in the present Office Action are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments and/or arguments.

The Examiner objects to the Table A comprising SSR data inserted on page 16 of the specification at line 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 132 as new matter. Applicant objects to the Examiner's objection of new matter however in order to expedite prosecution Applicant herein cancels the above-referenced material that had been filed April 22, 2003, thus alleviating this rejection.

Applicant acknowledges the objection of claims 51 and 55-57 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Although not acceding to the Examiner's objection, Applicant has canceled claims 51 and 55-57, thereby rendering these objections moot.

B. Newly Submitted Claims

Applicant acknowledges the addition of new claims 58 through 87, as specifically stated by the claims faxed by Examiner David Fox on November 15, 2002 and the new sample claim submitted by Supervisory Patent Examiner Amy Nelson via e-mail on August 7, 2003 and revised via telephone on August 25, 2003 and September 2, 2003 and per the meeting of supervisory and primary Examiners on September 11, 2003. The new claims do not add new matter as there is support for the claims in the originally filed specification. Support for the specific items noted in the claims faxed by Examiner Fox can be found within the specification for *Bacillus thuringiensis* on page 28; for imidazolinone, sulfonylurea, glyphosate, glufosinate, L-phosphinothricin, triazine, and benzonitrile on pages 31-32; for phytase on page 32; for stearyl-ACP desaturase, fructosyltransferase, levansucrase, alpha-amylase, invertase and starch

branching enzyme on pages 32-33; and for waxy starch and increased amylose starch on pages 21 and 33. In addition, Applicant has amended the specification to clarify the deposit language. No new matter has been added by the present amendment. Entry of this Amendment After Final and approval of the changes is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 51-53 and 55-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 51 and 55 stand indefinite for improper Markush terminology.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The proper Markush format incorporating the use of the conjunction "and" is used in claims 51 and 55, MPEP § 2173.05(h). Although not acceding to the Examiner's rejection, in order to expedite prosecution Applicant has canceled claims 51 and 55, thus alleviating this rejection.

The Examiner rejects claims 52 and 53 as indefinite because the claims do not obviate the indefiniteness of claim 51.

Although not acceding to the Examiner's rejection, in order to expedite prosecution Applicant has canceled claims 51 and 52-53, thereby alleviating this rejection.

Claims 56 and 57 stand rejected as indefinite because the claims do not obviate the indefiniteness of claim 55.

Although not acceding to the Examiner's rejection, in order to expedite prosecution Applicant has now canceled claims 55 and 56-57, alleviating this rejection.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 43 and 50-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Examiner states that claim 43 recites "at least 50%

genetic contribution from" and claims 50-52 recite "backcross conversion" in which there is no basis in the specification for either term therefore constituting new matter.

Although not acceding to the Examiner's rejection, to expedite prosecution Applicant has canceled claims 43 and 50-53, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Applicant has added new claims 58-87, as specifically stated by the claims faxed by Examiner David Fox on November 15, 2002 and the new sample claim submitted by Supervisory Patent Examiner Amy Nelson via e-mail on August 7, 2003 and revised via telephone on August 25, 2003 and September 2, 2003 and per the meeting of supervisory and primary Examiners on September 11, 2003. The new claims do not add new matter as there is support for the claims in the originally filed specification as described *supra*.

Claims 9, 10, 15, 16, 37-39, 41-43 remain rejected and claims 50-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, for the reasons of record in the Office Action mailed December 23, 2002.

Applicant traverses this rejection. Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution claims 9, 10, 15, 16, 37-39, 41-43, and 50-57 have been canceled and new claims 58-87 have been added as disclosed *supra*. Applicant requests reconsideration.

Claims 9, 10, 15, 16, 37-39, 41-43 remain rejected and claims 50-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention, for the reasons of record in the Office Action mailed December 23, 2002. The Examiner also asserts that Hunsperger *et al.* and Kraft *et al.* teach that it is unpredictable whether the gene or genes responsible for conferring a phenotype in one plant genotypic background may be introgressed into the genetic background of a different plant, to confer a desired phenotype is said different plant.

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The Applicant has provided assurance that at least 2500 seeds of inbred maize line PH0GC have been deposited with the ATCC. In view of this assurance, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, should be removed. (MPEP § 2411.02). Although not acceding to the Examiner's rejection, to expedite prosecution the Applicant has canceled claims 9, 10, 15, 16, 37-39, 41-43, and 50-57, thereby rendering this

rejection moot. The Applicant has added new claims 58-87, as disclosed *supra*. It is respectfully submitted that Applicant's claims are sufficiently described and enabled by the specification.

In addition, Applicant asserts that the introgression of mutant genes and transgenes is easily, routinely and extensively practiced by those of ordinary skill in the art. Backcrossing has been known since the 1920's and, because of its predictability, is the method preferred by commercial plant breeders to introduce transgenes into already developed and tested material. An example of how one of ordinary skill in the art can transfer a gene conferring a qualitative trait into a variety through backcrossing is demonstrated by the fact that the commercial market now distributes a multitude of products produced in this manner. Such conversion lines are easily developed without undue experimentation.

Further, the Applicant would like to reiterate that a patent application "need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art." *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 231 U.S.P.Q. 81 (Fed. Cir. 1986); MPEP § 601.

The Applicant also respectfully disagrees with the Examiner as to what is taught by Hunsperger *et al.* Hunsperger *et al.* merely teaches that a gene that results in dwarfism of a petunia plant can be incorporated into other genetic backgrounds of the petunia species (See column 2, line 67 to column 3, lines 1-4). Hunsperger *et al.* merely discusses that the level of the expression of that gene differed in petunia plants of different genetic backgrounds. Hunsperger *et al.* succeeded in incorporating the gene into petunia plants of different genetic backgrounds. In fact, the USPTO in Hunsperger *et al.* allowed claims to any petunia plant comprising genes for dwarfism. Therefore, Hunsperger *et al.* supports the fact that one can introgress a specific trait into a recurrent parent through backcross conversion. Applicant's specification provides ample disclosure of starting materials such as, maize inbred line PH0GC, a discussion of traditional breeding methods, and examples of transgenes and naturally occurring genes that may be used in such methods. Hallauer *et al.* (1988) on page 472, submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement, states that, "For single gene traits that are relatively easy to classify, the backcross method is effective and relatively easy to manage." The teaching of Hallauer *et al.* relates specifically to corn breeding and corn inbred line development.

The Examiner further stated in the Office Action of December 23, 2002 that, "Kraft *et al.* teaches that linkage disequilibrium effects and linkage drag prevent the making of plants comprising a single gene conversion, and that such effects are unpredictably genotypic specific

and loci-dependent in nature" (page 323, column 1, lines 7-15). Applicant disagrees that the article states such points. Kraft *et al.* makes no mention of a plant comprising a single gene conversion or the use of backcrossing. Further, Kraft *et al.* relates to linkage disequilibrium and fingerprinting in sugar beet, a crop other than maize. Kraft *et al.* states, on page 326, first column, "The generality of our results for other crop species needs to be investigated."

It is understood by those of skill in the art that backcross conversions are routinely produced and do not represent a substantial change to a variety. The World Seed Organization, on its web site, writes, "The concept of an essentially derived variety was introduced into the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention in order to avoid plagiarism through mutation, multiple backcrossing and to fill the gap between Plant Breeder's Rights and patents." As determined by the UPOV Convention, "essentially derived varieties may be obtained for example by the selection of a natural or induced mutant, or of a somaclonal variant, the selection of a variant individual from plants of the initial variety, backcrossing, or transformation by genetic engineering".

The Applicant also adds that transferring a qualitative trait does not require undue experimentation. Please note Hallauer *et al.* (1988) on page 472, submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement, which states, "For single gene traits that are relatively easy to classify, the backcross method is effective and relatively easy to manage." In newly submitted claims 58-87, the genes transferred into PH0GC are now limited to the traits of disease resistance, insect resistance, herbicide resistance, male sterility, waxy starch, and a nucleic acid molecule that encodes an enzyme that modifies fatty acid metabolism, phytic acid metabolism or carbohydrate metabolism. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection. For the reasons aforementioned, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's claims are sufficiently described and enabled by the specification.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to claims 9, 10, 15, 16, 37-39, 41-43, and 50-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Summary

Applicant acknowledges that claims 1, 2, 4-8, 21, 23-27, and 40 are allowed.

Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by Examiner David Fox and Supervisory Patent Examiner Amy Nelson as allowable. Applicant submits the claims place the application

in condition for allowance and comply with all requirements of form set forth in previous office actions.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Applicant submits in light of the above amendments and remarks, the claims as amended are in a condition for allowance, and reconsideration is respectfully requested. If it is felt that it would aid in prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number indicated to discuss any outstanding issues.

No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 26-0084.

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Lila A. T. Akrad, Reg. No. 52,550
McKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.
801 Grand Avenue, Suite 3200
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721
Phone No: (515) 288-3667
Fax No: (515) 288-1338
CUSTOMER NO: 27142

Attorneys of Record

- bja -

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 14 2003

OFFICIAL